DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 427 587 HE 031 778

AUTHOR Eimers, Mardy T.; Braxton, John M.; Bayer, Alan E.
TITLE The Implications of Teaching Norms for the Improvement of Undergraduate Education in Teaching-Oriented Colleges. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE 1998-11-00
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (23rd, Miami, FL, November 5-8, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Instruction; Community Colleges; Educational Quality; Higher Education; *Instructional Improvement; Standards; *Teacher Attitudes; *Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; Liberal Arts Colleges

ABSTRACT

This study examined the normative support by college faculty at teaching-oriented colleges (Liberal Arts I and II institutions and community colleges) of six recommendations commonly offered for the improvement of undergraduate education and compared findings to a similar study at Research I and Comprehensive II institutions. Tenured full-time faculty (n=647) in the fields of psychology, mathematics, and biology at liberal arts and community colleges responded to a college teaching behaviors inventory, which requested faculty views on six recommended teaching behaviors: (1) encouragement of faculty and student contact; (2) systematic program of advisement; (3) feedback on student performance; (4) faculty knowledge of students; (5) fostering of egalitarianism and tolerance in the classroom; and (6) demonstration of a concern for improving college teaching. Results suggest that norms are in place for three of the six recommendations student advisement, prompt feedback, and egalitarian classroom atmosphere, which are the same three recommendations that receive support from faculty at research and comprehensive universities. (Contains 34 references.) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 427 587

The Implications of Teaching Norms for the Improvement of Undergraduate Education in Teaching-Oriented Colleges

Mardy T. Eimers
Senior Analyst, Planning & Budget
Adjunct Assistant Professor, Educational Leadership
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65211
(573)-882-3412
eimersm@umsystem.edu

John M. Braxton
Associate Professor
Department of Educational Leadership
Vanderbilt University
Peabody College
Box 514
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
(615)-322-8000

Alan E. Bayer
Professor of Sociology and
Director of the Center for Survey Research
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
(540)-231-3676

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ASHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

This paper was presented at the 1998 Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) held in Miami, Florida, November 5-8, 1998.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ASHE *Association for the Study of Higher Education*

Headquartered at the University of Missouri-Columbia • College of Education • Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis • 211 Hill Hall, Columbia, MO 65211 • 573-882-9645 • fax 573-884-5714

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held in Miami, Florida, November 5-8, 1998. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

Introduction

During the last fifteen years a number of recommendations to improve undergraduate education in our colleges and universities have been put forth (e.g., Association of American Colleges, 1984; Boyer, 1987, 1990; Chickering & Gamson, 1987; Gaff, 1991; McKeachie, 1994; Weimer, 1992). These recommendations, for example, range from promoting more interaction between faculty and students to providing students with more formative feedback on assignments, enabling students to take a more active role in their own learn, and encouraging faculty to allow students to learn from each other the classroom. However, even though many of these recommendations have been publicly endorsed by the higher education community, it is not difficult to find individual faculty members, academic departments, and sometimes entire colleges that have made relatively few strides toward successfully implementing these recommendations within the academic culture of the institution.

While it is relatively easy to support these recommendations, it is quite another to implement them successfully. We maintain that the implementation of any improvement in undergraduate education is more likely to be successful if norms, or group standards of appropriate and inappropriate behavior, support the recommendation. In this study we focus primarily on the teaching dimension of undergraduate education. Thus, norms become particularly salient as faculty have considerable autonomy and can enact teaching recommendations according to their own preferences. That is, if norms support a given recommendation then a faculty member is more likely to enact it. On the other hand, if little normative support for a given recommendation is present among the faculty, then that recommendation will be less likely endorsed.

What is particularly compelling, then, is whether norms espoused by faculty support specific recommendations to improve undergraduate education? And, does this normative support vary with faculty at different types of institutions and with faculty affiliated with different disciplinary areas? These questions and others form the basis for this inquiry.

Norms are shared beliefs within a social or professional group of what behavior ought to be in a given situation or circumstance (Gibbs, 1981; Merton, 1968; 1973). The focus on norms emanates from Durkheim's (1951) supposition that nonconformity is the normal human condition and conformity is abnormal. Durkheim's assertion is reinforced by the high degree of autonomy faculty have in the teaching role. Hence, norms are necessary to assure conformity (Reiss, 1951), and conformity is essential for the recommendations to be realized throughout an institution such as a college or university.

In terms of norms regarding undergraduate education, we are just beginning to understand some of the underlining premises in this area of research. Braxton, Bayer, and Finkelstein (1992) identified a normative structure for undergraduate college teaching—four domains characterized in the negative as Interpersonal Disregard, Particularistic Grading, Moral Turpitude, and Inadequate Planning. Braxton, Eimers, and Bayer (1996) broadened this scope and examined whether there was normative support for six specific recommendations to improve undergraduate education that have been widely endorsed in the literature. Surveying faculty from both Research I and Comprehensive II institutions, the authors reported that three recommendations were supported by norms and three were not. The recommendations supported were "systematic program of advisement," "providing students with feedback," and "fostering an egalitarian classroom

climate." However, normative support for three of the recommendations— "learning about students," "encouraging faculty-student contact," and "concern to improve teaching"—were not evident among faculty sampled.

In the present study we were interested in whether normative support for these six recommendations to improve undergraduate education would be different at colleges that primarily emphasize undergraduate education (i.e., teaching-oriented colleges). That is, Research I universities and Comprehensive II institutions offer graduate as well as undergraduate programs. Scholarly inquiry is an essential mission of the Research I universities and an encouraged mission at the Comprehensive II institutions. However, at colleges where few if any graduate program exist and where undergraduate education is clearly the primary mission, might we find a different pattern of normative support for the six recommendations to improve undergraduate education?

Teaching-Oriented Colleges

For this study we identified Liberal Arts I colleges (LA I), Liberal Arts II colleges (LA II), and Community colleges as "teaching-oriented" colleges. Liberal Arts I and II colleges primarily offer only baccalaureate degrees. Where LA I colleges are quite selective in admissions and confer at least 40% of their degrees in liberal arts and sciences fields, LA II college are less selective and award fewer than 40% of their degrees in liberal arts and sciences fields (Carnegie Foundation, 1987). Community colleges, on the other hand, offer a wide variety of vocational and certificate degree programs that are typically one- to two-year programs (Carnegie Foundation, 1987). Students at Community colleges can also enroll in more traditional liberal arts and sciences courses with the intent of transferring to a four-year institution after completing requirement for the associate's degree. Community colleges are generally open admission colleges.

Nevertheless, the difference between teaching-oriented colleges and research universities or comprehensive institutions goes well beyond the degrees they confer and students they teach. Teaching-oriented colleges are unequivocally dedicated to the undergraduate student and undergraduate education (e.g., see Wright & Burden, 1986; McGee, 1971). This overarching mission penetrates the academic culture of these institutions and is reflected in faculty priorities, goals, rewards, and values. For example, the priorities of faculty at teaching-oriented colleges typically reflect an emphasis on local issues such as the curriculum, student advising, campus governance, student extra-curricular involvement, and of course, undergraduate teaching (Clark, 1987). This is not to suggest that research and scholarship does not take place at these institutions. In fact, some faculty, particularly those at LA I colleges, make frequent scholarly contributions to their disciplines. However, even these scholarly pursuits are often coalesced around involving undergraduates in research (Ruscio, 1987). Thus, the emphasis directed toward undergraduate education at teaching-oriented colleges suggests that the normative support for the six recommendations to improve undergraduate education may be different than what was identified with faculty at research and comprehensive institutions.

Research Questions

This study investigated the normative support for the six recommendations to improve undergraduate education among faculty at Liberal Arts I colleges, Liberal Arts II colleges, and Community colleges (Carnegie Foundation, 1987). Although these institutions have varying levels

of admission selectivity and orientation to the disciplines, their primary focus is undoubtedly undergraduate education. In addition, one might expect variations among faculty affiliated with different disciplines at teaching-oriented colleges. Thus, this study addresses three questions:
1) Are faculty norms present at teaching-oriented colleges to support recommendations that have been suggested to improve undergraduate education?
2) If faculty norms do support these recommendations, then do these norms vary across different types of teaching-oriented colleges?
3) If faculty norms do support these recommendations, then do these norms vary across academic disciplines at teaching-oriented colleges?

The study is important for at least two reasons. First, by extending the Braxton, Eimers, and Bayer (1996) inquiry to teaching-oriented colleges, we can begin to develop a more comprehensive understanding of normative support for the improvement of undergraduate education across a range of higher education institutions. Second, this study may provide at least some perspective as to the ease or difficulty we might expect if genuine efforts are made to implement these recommendations at different types of institutions and within different academic disciplines. That is, college faculty enjoy significant levels of professional autonomy. They have the choice to accept or reject recommendations that have been suggested to improve undergraduate education. However, their acceptance or rejection of these recommendations will depend significantly on whether norms are in place to support a particular recommendation.

Recommendations to Improve Undergraduate Education

To identify the recommendations, we thoroughly reviewed the literature that focused on improving undergraduate teaching and learning, enhancing the undergraduate curriculum, and more general literature on strengthening the undergraduate academic experience. We looked at a variety of publications written for different audiences and purposes. After ensuring that each recommendation that we identified was endorsed by multiple authors, we introduced six recommendations to improve undergraduate teaching and learning. In addition, the recommendations that we investigated were contingent on the availability of data on faculty perceptions of prevailing norms related to each of the six recommendations. Each of these recommendations is described in the following paragraphs.

Encouragement of Faculty and Student Contact. In *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education,* Chickering and Gamson specifically identified "encouraging student-faculty contact" as one of seven principles (Chickering & Gamson, 1987). This recommendation has also been widely endorsed by several other publications and reports (e.g., Boyer, 1987; Eble & Mc Keachie, 1985; Mayhew, Ford, & Hubbard, 1990; National Institute of Education, 1984).

Systematic Program of Advisement. The undergraduate experience is greatly improved when students are advised when choosing courses, deciding a major, determining what college activities and experiences best meet their academic and future needs, and when students are counseled as they make career plans (Boyer, 1987; National Institute of Education, 1984; Gaff, 1991; Mayhew et al., 1990). Advising is particularly salient when the same individual, especially if it is a faculty member, can advise the student throughout his or her career (National Institute of Education, 1984). When confronted with issues outside his or her expertise, faculty advisors should at least be

familiar with campus resources and personnel that can assist the student.

Feedback on Student Performance. This recommendation was widely supported by the vast majority of publications and reports. It suggests that students should receive frequent, prompt, and constructive feedback on their assignments, projects, and examinations. For example, *Integrity in the College Curriculum* (Association of American Colleges, 1985) recommends that students have every reason to expect that "tests and papers that are a part of the learning process will be fairly graded, promptly returned, and provided with helpful comment by the instructor." Students should be informed of their strengths and weaknesses so that can work to improve (Chickering & Gamson, 1987; Bok, 1986) and faculty should vary assignments so that students can receive feedback in a variety of forms (Mancini & Tiberius, 1991).

Learn about Students. Effective teaching hinges largely on recognizing and learning student interests and characteristics in one's class and then using examples and giving assignments based on these interests and characteristics (Katz, 1985). "Unless teachers know their students reasonably well, it is impossible for them to know whether or how any given idea will be understood, integrated into the mind, or used by the student" (Gaff, 1991).

Foster Egalitarianism and Tolerance in the Classroom. Faculty members should respect the diverse backgrounds and interests students bring to a class and are encouraged to promote interaction among students so they can learn from each other (Mancini & Tiberius, 1991). When given the opportunity to participate in classroom discussions, students should feel comfortable expressing their opinions and perspectives without receiving inappropriate criticism from classmates or the faculty member (Gaff, 1991). In addition, fostering an egalitarian classroom climate provides an avenue for all students to participate and take an active role in their own learning.

Demonstration of a Concern for Improving College Teaching. One of the most pronounced recommendations—suggested in nearly every report or article we reviewed—was that all faculty members should strive to enhance their skills as a college teacher (e.g.,Boyer, 1987; 1991; Mayhew et al., 1990; Eble & McKeachie, 1985; Gaff, 1991). Eble and McKeachie (1985) help to illuminate this recommendation: "the ability to analyze the teaching situation, to monitor one's own effectiveness, and to adapt one's methods to a particular class and a particular teaching situation are elements in continuing development as a faculty member." This recommendation is especially salient because faculty typically have little formal training in college teaching and student learning. Furthermore, as different modes of technology become more pervasive in the college learning environment, it is imperative that faculty members learn to use these and other tools to enhance their teaching.

Method

The population of inference included tenured, full-time faculty in biology, psychology, mathematics, and biology holding academic appointments at Liberal Arts I colleges, Liberal Arts II colleges and Community colleges. LA I colleges are highly selective undergraduate institutions that emphasize undergraduate education but also encourage scholarly inquiry. LA II colleges are less selective institutions that place significant emphasis on undergraduate teaching and comparatively little emphasis on scholarly inquiry. The third category, two-year community colleges, offer certificate or degree programs through the associate of arts level. These colleges are

generally open admission institutions and are singly dedicated to undergraduate education and training. Faculty from the four academic disciplines were selected because they represent different categories of the Biglan (1973) schema. Studies have indicated discipline differences among faculty in terms of goals, preferences toward teaching or research, how time is spent, among other aspects (Creswell & Roskens, 1981). In addition, we only selected tenured, full-time faculty because they are more likely to have a greater degree of autonomy and have generally been teaching sufficiently long as to have crystallized their normative standards.

Research Design

A cluster sampling design was used in this research. This design involved the random selection of specific institutions from the LA I, LA II, and the Community college categories of the Carnegie Classification (1987). Then for the LA I and LA II categories, 400 faculty members were selected with a quota of 100 from each subject matter area. For the Community college category, 800 faculty members were selected with a quota of 200 from each subject matter area. Thus, 1600 faculty members were mailed the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory (CTBI). Combined, the response rate at the LA I and LA II colleges was 47.8%; the community college sample garnered a 33.1% response rate.

When returns from both samples were complete, we examined the possibility of response bias in accordance with Goode and Hatt (1952) and Leslie (1972). This technique assumes that late respondents are similar to non-respondents. Thus, by testing for statistically significant differences between early respondents and late respondents on a handful of key variables, one can get a much better sense as to whether response bias might exist. An analysis between early and late respondents for both surveys yielded relatively few differences between early and late respondents and we concluded that response bias was minimal.

The CTBI was designed and constructed by Braxton, Bayer and Finkelstein (1992) as an exploratory instrument to identify undergraduate college teaching behaviors which are subject to normative criteria. The CTBI includes 126 items organized around seven areas: in class practices, out of class practices, faculty-student interaction, examination and grading practices, course planning and design, the first day of class, and the instructor's relationships with colleagues. Each of the 126 behaviors was negatively worded to put each behavior in the form of a violation of a possible norm. This method follows the contention of both Durkheim (1951) and Kitsuse (1972) that norms are best recognized when they are violated.

Individuals were asked to indicate their opinion on each specific behavior as they might ideally apply to a faculty member teaching a lower division college course of about 40 enrolled students. Individual faculty reactions to each of the specific behaviors were indicated by the use of the following five-point rating scale: (1) appropriate behavior, should be encouraged, (2) discretionary behavior, neither particularly appropriate nor inappropriate, (3) mildly inappropriate, generally to be ignored, (4) inappropriate behavior, to be handled informally by colleagues or administrators suggesting change or improvement, and (5) very inappropriate behavior, requiring formal administrative intervention. By having faculty members ascribe sanctions to inappropriate teaching behaviors, we followed the Durkheimian principle of indexing the degree of moral indignation evoked by a violation of a norm (Durkheim, 1934; Zuckerman, 1977; 1988).

Table 1 identifies the composite variables and the items—selected from the CTBI—that we

used to measure each of six recommendations to improve undergraduate education. To ascertain whether normative support existed for a give recommendation, we summed the values for the items in a given composite variable and determined the mean score. Only those behaviors for which relatively strong sanctions (mean value of 3.5 or higher on the scale above) were judged to be suitable to be designated as a norm. That is, a value of 3.0 represents "mildly inappropriate behavior" but not to the level that it would invoke action. A value of 4.0 represents "inappropriate behavior" whereby actions would be recommended. We felt that the 3.5 level represented a degree of inappropriateness that would not be ignored.

Data Analysis

There were two sets of independent variables, Institutional Type and Discipline Area, and six dependent variables, one for each Teaching Behavior. That is, the variable set Teaching Behaviors included six variables which corresponded to the six selected recommendations for improving undergraduate education. Each variable was a composite measure of a faculty member's reaction to a set of teaching behaviors, selected from the CBTI, for each of the six recommendations.

For the first research question, we used the mean values of the six Teaching Behavior variables to determine whether or not these particular patterns of behavior met the definition of a norm. For the second and third questions, we used a 3x4 Analysis of Variance: the three institutional types by the four disciplinary areas. Because of the possibility of heterogeneous variances, we used the .01 level to identify statistical significance. In those cases where statistically significant F-Ratios for institutional type or discipline were identified, we employed the Scheffe method to determine statistically significant group differences at the institutional level or at the disciplinary level.

Results

Question 1: Norms exist for three of the six recommendations to improve undergraduate education. The recommendations are "systematic program of advisement" (mean=3.87), "providing students with feedback" (mean=3.72), and "fostering an egalitarian classroom climate" (mean=3.62). Norms do not exist for the "encouragement of faculty and student contact" (mean=3.24), "learning about students" (mean=2.58), and "concern to improve teaching" (mean=3.16).

Question 2: Although norms appear to support three of the recommendations, it is possible that any one of these norms may not be present at either LA I colleges, LA II colleges, or Community colleges. For the recommendations where normative support was noted, we also found normative support at each of the institutions. Likewise, for the three recommendations that were not supported by norms, we noted that these recommendations were also not supported by norms at each type of college. In addition, we found a statistically significant difference between LA II colleges (mean=4.00) and Community colleges (mean=3.79) for the recommendation "systematic program of advisement." However, each value surpassed the 3.5 mean value that delineates a norm. There were also statistically significant differences between LA II colleges and Community colleges for "encouraging for faculty-student contact" (LA II=3.39; CC=3.24) and "concern to improve teaching" (LA II=3.33; CC=3.19). Nevertheless, norms did not support the

two recommendations at either institutional type.

Question 3: In terms of disciplinary differences, we found normative support for "systematic program of advisement" and "providing students with feedback" among all four disciplines. For "fostering an egalitarian classroom climate," we found normative support for biology, psychology, and history but not for math (mean=3.42). For the recommendations that did not receive normative support, we also found no normative support at the individual disciplinary levels. We did identify statistically significant differences between biology (mean=3.40) and psychology (mean=3.04) for "encouraging student-faculty contact" and for the same two disciplines, biology (mean=2.70) and psychology (mean=2.41), for "learning about students." Regardless, norms did not support these two recommendations within either of these disciplinary areas.

Discussion

The results of this study reveal several important findings and implications. First, these results suggest that norms are in place among teaching-oriented colleges for three of the six recommendations. Following Durkheim's formulation that conformity is an abnormal human condition, the likelihood of successfully implementing these recommendations is strongest where normative support is in place. Evidently, faculty at teaching-oriented colleges feel strongly about advising their students effectively, providing prompt feedback on assignments, and creating an egalitarian atmosphere in the classroom where students share ideas and learn from each other.

Second, successful implementation of the other recommendations—"encouraging faculty-student contact," "learning about students," and "concern to improve teaching"—is less assured and special efforts may be necessary to enhance the likelihood of their successful implementation at these colleges. From one perspective, the lack of normative support for these three recommendations is somewhat surprising given that these colleges focus largely on undergraduate education. Many of these institutions have certainly shared with prospective students that "faculty are accessible, they get to know you, and they strive to improve their effectiveness as teachers." Nevertheless, faculty apparently feel that non-compliance does not justify potential sanctions.

Although all three types of colleges are dedicated to undergraduate education, there are differences among these types of institutions. Faculty at LA I colleges are frequently educated at the top universities, have solid research records, and work with high-caliber students (Ruscio, 1987). In comparison, faculty at Community colleges are probably less likely to engage in research, hold a terminal degree, and on average, teach students of such high quality. LA II colleges more than likely fall somewhere in between. Consequently, a third issue is the consistency found among the teaching-oriented colleges regarding the normative support (or lack thereof) for the recommendations.

Even more remarkable, a fourth consideration is that normative support for the same recommendations was noted among faculty at Research I universities and Comprehensive II institutions (and the lack of norm support for the same three recommendations) (Braxton, Eimers, and Bayer, 1996). From a national perspective, the consistency among these institutions suggests that we are likely to have better success in implementing recommendations that encourage faculty to advise students effectively, provide them with prompt feedback on assignments, and work to develop an egalitarian classroom climate. Conversely, because norms are not in place for the other recommendations, substantially more effort may be required to successfully implement these

recommendations across the institutions studied. This may call for more collaborative and concerted initiatives among national associations and higher education institutions to identify effective strategies to implement these recommendations.

Fifth, faculty members at teaching-oriented colleges tended to support or refute norms for the six recommendations to improve undergraduate education regardless of their disciplinary affiliation. This finding appears to be consistent with Clark (1987) and others who have suggested that institutional affiliation can have a powerful effect on faculty behavior. The influence of institutional affiliation, in contrast to disciplinary affiliation, would also seem to be particularly influential among faculty affiliated with teaching-oriented colleges. That is, because of the emphasis on undergraduate education and the campus community, these faculty members may find it more difficult to assert typical cosmopolitan perspectives (e.g., maintaining ties with disciplinary colleagues, publishing, attending and presenting at disciplinary associations, etc.). Furthermore, because only tenured faculty members were surveyed, the culture of the institution has had time to resinate with these individuals.

In conclusion, this study examined the normative support for recommendations to improve undergraduate education at teaching-oriented colleges. These findings, coupled with an earlier study that examined normative support for the same recommendations at institutions more focused toward graduate education and research, has shed substantial light on establishing a more comprehensive understanding of how norms among the academic community support initiative to improve undergraduate education. Probably the most important conclusion that can be put forth from these initial studies is that normative support is relatively consistent among the institutions studied in light of the known differences in faculty roles, priorities, values, and rewards at these colleges and universities. Nevertheless, the findings of this study add to an area of research that is essentially in its infancy and hopefully this study will lead to similar inquiries.

REFERENCES

Association of American Colleges. (1985). *Integrity in the College Curriculum: A Report to the Academic Community*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.

Biglan, A. (1973). Relationships between Subject Matter Area Characteristics and Output of University Departments. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57, 204-213.

Bok, D. (1986). *Higher Learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Boneau, C.A. (1960). The Effects of Violations of Assumptions Underlying the t Test. *Psychological Bulletin*, 57, 49-64.

Boyer, E. L. (1987). *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America*. New York: Harper & Row.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Braxton, J.M., Eimers, M.T., Bayer, A.E. (1996). The implications of teaching norms for the improvement of undergraduate education. *Jounrnal of Higher Education*, 67,603-25.

Braxton, J.M., Bayer, A.E., and Finkelstein, M.J. (1992). Teaching Performance Norms in Academia. *Research in Higher Education*, 33, 533-569.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1987). *A Classification of Institutions for Higher Education*. Princeton, N.J.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Chickering, A. W., and Gamson, Z. E. (1987). Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education. *AAHE Bulletin*, 39, 3-7.

Clark, B.R. (1987). *The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnigie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Creswell, J.W. and Roskens, R.W. (1981).The Biglan Studies of Differences among Academic Areas. *The Review of Higher Education*, 4, 1-16.

Durkheim, E. (1934). *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. London: Allen and Unwin (Original work published in 1912).

Durkheim, E. (1951). *Suicide*, trans. J.H. Saulding and G. Simpson. New York: Free Press.

Eble, K.E., and McKeachie, W. J. (1985). *Improving Undergraduate Education through Faculty Development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gaff, J.G. (1991). *New Life for the College Curriculum*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gibbs, J.P. (1981). *Norms, Deviance and Social Control: Conceptual Matters*. New York: Elsevier.

Goode, W.J. and Hatt, P.K. (1952). *Methods of Social Research*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Katz, J. (1985). Teaching Based on Knowledge of Students." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 21, 3-11.

Kitsuse, J.I. (1972). Deviance, Deviant Behavior, and Deviants: Some Conceptual Issues. In *An Introduction to Deviance*, W.J. Filstead, 233-43, Chicago: Markham.

Leslie, L.L. (1972). Are Response Rates Essential to Valid Surveys? *Social Science Research*, 323-334.

Mancini, B.J. and Tiberius, R. G. (1991). Effective Social Arrangements for Teaching and

Learning." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 45, 87-109.
Mayhew, L.B., Ford, P. J., and Hubbard, D. L. (1990). *The Quest for Quality: The Challenge for Undergraduate Education in the 1990s*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
McGee, R. (1971). *Academic Janus*. San Franscisco: Jossey-Bass.
McKeachie, W.J. (1994). *Teaching Tips: A Guide for the Beginning College Teacher*. Lexington, MA: Heath.
Merton, R.K. (1968). *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: The Free Press.
Merton, R.K. (1973). *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
National Institute of Education. (1984). *Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.
Reiss, A. (1951). Delinquency as a Failure of Personal and Social Controls. *American Sociological Review*, 16, 196-207.
Ruscio, K.P. (1987). The distinct scholarship of the selective liberal arts college. *Journal of Higher Education*, 58, 205-221.
Weimer, M. (1992). *Improving College Teaching: Strategies of Developing Instructional Effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Wright, R.A., & Burden, J.A. (1986). *Teaching in the small college: Issues and applications*. New York: Greenwood Press.
Zuckerman, H.E. (1977). Deviant Behavior and Social Control in Science. In *Deviance and Social Change*, E. Sagarin (ed.), 87-138, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
Zuckerman, H.E. (1988). The Sociology of Science. In *Handbook of Sociology*, Neal J. Smelser (ed.), 511-574, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Table 1

Teaching Behaviors Instrumental to the Achievement of the Six Recommendations to Improve Undergraduate Education

---

Encouragement of Faculty and Student Contact (Faculty-Student Contact)

(Cronbach's alpha = .48)

Violations:

* Office hours scheduled for student appointments are frequently not kept.
* A faculty member avoids spending time with students outside of class time and/or regular office hours.
* A faculty member insists that they never be phoned at home by students regardless of circumstances.

Systematic Program of Advisement (Program of Advisement)

(Cronbach's alpha = .68)

Violations:

* A faculty member does not refer a student with a special problem to the appropriate campus service.
* An advisee is treated in a condescending manner.
* A faculty member avoids giving career or job advice when asked by students.
* A faculty member refuses to advise departmental majors.

Feedback on Student Performance (Performance Feedback)

(Cronbach's alpha = .65)

Violations:

* Graded tests and papers are not promptly returned to students by the instructor.
* Explanation of the basis for grades given for essay questions or papers is not provided to students.
* Written comments on tests and papers are consistently not made by the instructor.

Learn about Students (Learn about Students)

(Cronbach's alpha = .46)

Violations:

* Students are not asked to record their background, experiences and interests for reference by the instructor.
* The instructor does not learn the names of all students in the class.

Table 1 (continued)

Foster Egalitarianism and Tolerance in the Classroom (Classroom Climate)
(Cronbach's alpha = .61)
Violations:
* The instructor insists that the student take one particular perspective on course content.
* Students are not permitted to express viewpoints different from those of the instructor.
* The instructor does not allow students to direct their comments to other members of the class.

Demonstration of a Concern for the Improving of College Teaching (Improving Teaching)
(Cronbach's alpha = .76)
Violations:
* A faculty member avoids reading literature on teaching techniques or methods.
* A faculty member avoids professional development opportunities that would enhance their teaching.
* The instructor does not introduce new teaching methods or procedures.

Note: These behaviors are negatively worded because of the method for identifying norms used in this study. See text for discussion.

Note: The following code was provided for respondents to indicate their reactions to these behaviors: (1) appropriate behavior, should be encouraged, (2) discretionary behavior, neither particularly appropriate nor inappropriate, (3) mildly inappropriate behavior, generally to be ignored, (4) inappropriate behavior, to be handled informally by colleagues or administrators suggesting change or improvement, and (5) very inappropriate behavior, requiring formal administrative intervention.

Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations for the Six Teaching Behaviors by All Faculty and Institutional Type

		Faculty-Student Contact		Program of Advisement		Performance Feedback		Learn about Students		Classroom Climate		Improving Teaching	
	N	Mean	s.d.	Mean	s.d.	Mean	s.d.	Mean	s.d.	Mean	s.d.	Mean	s.d.
All Faculty	416	3.24	0.67	**3.87**	0.59	**3.73**	0.67	2.58	0.63	**3.62**	0.68	3.16	0.77
Institutional Type													
Community Colleges	175	3.13	0.64	**3.79**	0.64	**3.74**	0.72	2.55	0.64	**3.58**	0.72	3.19	0.79
Liberal Arts II Colleges	120	3.40	0.76	**4.00**	0.57	**3.76**	0.65	2.71	0.69	**3.67**	0.69	3.34	0.75
Liberal Arts I Colleges	121	3.26	0.58	**3.86**	0.52	**3.68**	0.58	2.48	0.55	**3.65**	0.62	2.93	0.69

Mean > 3.5 in bold.

Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations for the Six Teaching Behaviors by Academic Discipline

		Faculty-Student Contact		Program of Advisement		Performance Feedback		Learn about Students		Classroom Climate		Improving Teaching	
	N	Mean	s.d.	Mean	s.d.	Mean	s.d.	Mean	s.d.	Mean	s.d.	Mean	s.d.
Academic Discipline													
Math	90	3.35	0.71	**3.81**	0.58	**3.66**	0.64	2.61	0.67	3.42	0.68	3.11	0.74
Biology	122	3.40	0.75	**4.02**	0.59	**3.77**	0.69	2.70	0.71	**3.72**	0.63	3.34	0.68
Psychology	102	3.04	0.51	**3.80**	0.62	**3.70**	0.71	2.41	0.56	**3.65**	0.77	3.11	0.83
History	104	3.18	0.62	**3.81**	0.55	**3.77**	0.62	2.57	0.55	**3.67**	0.63	3.03	0.79

Mean > 3.5 in bold.